## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH CENTRAL DIVISION

GREEN OAK HEDGE FUND, Ltd., d/b/a GREEN OAK TRADING COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR A PREJUDGMENT WRIT OF ATTACHMENT

VS.

RICK HOPKINSON, ELITE TRADING INTERNATIONAL, LLC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:06-CV-636 TS

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for a Prejudgment Writ of Attachment. The Motion seeks a writ to issue against defendants Rick Hopkinson (Hopkinson) and Elite Trading International (Elite).

Fed. R. Civ. P. 64 provides that the remedy of prejudgment attachment is available "under the circumstances and in the manner provided by the law of the state in which the district court is held." In Utah, the substantive standard and the procedure governing prejudgment writs are contained in Utah R. Civ. P. 64A. That Rule provides that "the

affidavit supporting the motion shall state facts in simple, concise and direct terms that are

not conclusory."1

The Court finds that the Motion and Affidavit are merely conclusory and, therefore,

fail to establish grounds for a prejudgement writ of attachment. For example, neither the

Motion nor the Affidavit specify what property Plaintiff seeks to attach, in what manner

either Elite or Hopkinson is avoiding service of process,<sup>2</sup> in what manner Elite or Hopkinson

have an interest in any of the unspecified property to be attached, or any facts supporting

the allegation that either Elite or Hopkinson has, or is about to, assign, dispose of, or

conceal the unspecified property or property they seek to attach. Neither the Motion nor

the Affidavit contains any analysis of Plaintiff's likelihood of success on the merits. Plaintiff

having failed to establish grounds under Fed. R. Civ. P. 64 and Utah Rule Civ. 64A, it is

therefore

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for a Prejudgment Writ of Attachment (Docket No.

48) is DENIED.

**DATED June 4, 2007.** 

BY THE COURT:

TEØ STEWART

Únited States District Judge

<sup>1</sup>Utah R. Civ. P. 64A(c).

<sup>2</sup>Elite and Hopkinson were served and have filed Answers, see Docket Nos. 21

and 25.

2